

1745

IMAGE



**PATENT APPLICATION**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Saeko KURACHI

Group Art Unit: 1745

Application No.: 10/086,806

Examiner: R. Alejandro

Filed: March 4, 2002

Docket No.: 111204

For: CARBON MONOXIDE SELECTIVE OXIDIZING CATALYST AND  
MANUFACTURING METHOD FOR THE SAME

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the November 5, 2003 Restriction Requirement, Applicant provisionally elects Group I, claims 1-8, 11-19 and 22-23, with traverse.

Applicant specifically traverses the restriction requirement with respect to Groups I-III. Elected claims 1-8, 11-19 and 22-23 are product claims down to carbon monoxide selected oxidizing catalysts. Non-elected claim 9 depends from elected claim 1. In turn, non-elected claim 10, which depends from non-elected claim 9, indirectly depends from elected claim 1. Additionally, non-elected claim 20 depends from elected claim 11. In turn, non-elected claim 21, which depends from non-elected claim 20, indirectly depends from elected claim 11. Since non-elected claims 9 and 10 include all of the limitations of elected claim 1, rejoinder of non-elected claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested when claim 1 is allowed. Further, since non-elected claims 20 and 21 include all the limitations of elected claim 11,

rejoinder of non-elected claims 20 and 21 are respectfully requested when claim 11 is allowed.

Restriction with respect to Group IV, claims 24-40, is not traversed.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all claims 1-23 are sufficiently related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one Group of claims would encompass a search for the subject matter of the remaining claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden. See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application in order to avoid unnecessary delay and expense to Applicant and duplicative examination by the Patent Office.

Thus, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Sy  
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNS/cfr

Date: December 5, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--